

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending in the application. No claims have been amended, added, or cancelled. In view of the following comments, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, 17-22, 24-29 and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over East in view of Microsoft FrontPage. Applicants traverse these rejections on the following grounds.

EAST is not Prior Art

The Examiner has failed to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness in support of any of the pending claims. The Examiner has apparently relied, in part, on a series of captured screenshots from the "EAST Software Program" in an attempt to provide teachings or suggestions for various features set forth in the claims. The Examiner appears to have provided multiple "publication dates" for the EAST Software Program including apparent copyright dates of 1990-1998 for what appears to be a text processor called "TX TextControl," another copyright date of 1998 for the software program "EAST," and most notably, a date of June 2, 2004 for the version of the executable program from which the Examiner apparently captured the screenshots. The copyright dates provided by the Examiner do not provide the dates upon which the teachings relied upon by the Examiner were publicly available nor do they demonstrate that the teachings were in fact available as of any of these dates. Furthermore, the copyright dates are inconsistent with the version date of the executable itself. The Examiner has merely demonstrated that the teachings embodied in screenshots from the EAST Software Program were available in a version of the executable dated June 2, 2004. Hence, the Examiner has failed to show that the teachings relied upon were in fact publicly available prior to Applicants' priority date. Thus, based on the evidence provided by the Examiner, the EAST Software Program is not prior art with regard to Applicants' invention. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of record be withdrawn.

The Combination of EAST and Microsoft FrontPage do not Teach or Suggest Every Claim Feature

Even if EAST could be properly considered prior art, and Applicants assert that it cannot, the combination of EAST and Microsoft FrontPage do not teach or suggest every claim feature. Independent claim 1 recites, among other things, “a frame number specification object that enables the user to specify a number of frames in the plurality of predefined frameset arrangements that are simultaneously displayed.” At least this feature is not taught or suggested by EAST or Microsoft FrontPage, either alone or in combination with one another. The Examiner acknowledges that EAST does not “clearly teach a frame number specification object that enables the user to specify a number of frames” (*see* Office Action, page 3), and relies on Microsoft FrontPage to overcome this deficiency. However, Microsoft FrontPage also does not teach or suggest a frame number specification object that enables the user to specify a number of frames in the plurality of predefined frameset arrangements *that are simultaneously displayed*.

At best, Microsoft FrontPage appears to provide an option for a user to increase or decrease the number of frames *after the user has selected a layout* (*see* Microsoft FrontPage, pp. 310-311). This is not the same as providing a plurality of predefined frameset arrangements and providing a number specification object that enables the user to specify a number of frames in each of the plurality of frameset arrangements, as claimed. Because neither EAST nor Microsoft FrontPage, alone or in combination with each other teach or suggest this feature, claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Independent claims 8, 15, 22, and 29 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. As such, claims 8, 15, 22, and 29 are also patentable over the references relied upon by the Examiner the same reasons.

Claims 3-7, 10-14, 17-21, 24-28, and 31-33 depend from and add features to one of claims 1, 8, 15, 22, and 29. Thus, these dependent claims are patentable over the references relied upon the Examiner for at least the reasons described above.


Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: July 13, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

CUSTOMER NO.
00909



Rick A. Toering
Reg. No. 43,195
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
1600 Tysons Blvd.
McLean, VA 22102
703-905-2120